

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

DONNA L. FRIEDEBERG,

Plaintiff,

-against-

MICHELE FRIEDEBERG,

Defendant.

24-CV-8874 (LTS)

TRANSFER ORDER

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN, Chief United States District Judge:

Plaintiff Donna L. Friedeberg, who resides in Norwich, Connecticut, brings this *pro se* action alleging that Defendant Michele Friedeberg violated her rights. For the following reasons, the Court transfers this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1406 to the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut.

DISCUSSION

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), a civil action may be brought in

(1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.

Under Section 1391(c), a “natural person” resides in the district where the person is domiciled, and an “entity with the capacity to sue and be sued” resides in any judicial district where it is subject to personal jurisdiction with respect to the civil action in question. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(1), (2).

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated her rights at various locations in the State of Connecticut. She does not provide an address for Defendant, but states that she resides in

Hartford County, Connecticut. Because Plaintiff does not allege that Defendant is a resident of this District or that the events giving rise to her claims occurred in this District,¹ from the face of the complaint, it is clear that venue is not proper in this court under Section 1391(b)(1), (2).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1406, if a plaintiff files a case in the wrong venue, the Court “shall dismiss, or if it be in the interest of justice, transfer such case to any district or division in which it could have been brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). Plaintiff’s claims arose in Connecticut, which constitutes one judicial district. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 86. Accordingly, venue lies in the District of Connecticut, 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), and in the interest of justice, the Court transfers this action to the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

CONCLUSION

The Clerk of Court is directed to transfer this action to the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut. Whether Plaintiff should be permitted to proceed further without prepayment of fees is a determination to be made by the transferee court.² A summons shall not issue from this court. This order closes this case in this court.

¹ This judicial District, the Southern District of New York, is comprised of the following New York State counties: (1) New York (New York City Borough of Manhattan); (2) Bronx (New York City Borough of the Bronx); (3) Westchester; (4) Dutchess; (5) Rockland; (6) Orange; (7) Putnam; and (8) Sullivan. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 112(b).

² The Court notes that Plaintiff neither signed the complaint, nor paid the filing fees or submitted an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 22, 2024
New York, New York

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain
LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN
Chief United States District Judge